



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,829	02/20/2007	Luisa Urbano	42051/DOB/lp	6266
7590 Modiano & Associati Via Meravigli, 16 Milano, 20123 ITALY				
			EXAMINER MCDONALD, SHANTESE L	
			ART UNIT 3723	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/577,829

**Applicant(s)**

URBANO ET AL.

**Examiner**

Shantese L. McDonald

**Art Unit**

3723

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/1/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "said supporting device" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 14,15,17 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rust et al.

Rust et al. teaches a device for cleaning floors comprising a stick, 81, which is connected at a terminal portion by way of a kinematic connection means, 86, to a supporting means, 85, which is associable with cleaning means, 88, which is retained on the support means, wherein the supporting means comprises at least two arms, 84,85, which lie along a respective main longitudinal direction and comprise a

Art Unit: 3723

respective active face arranged so as to face a portion of the cleaning means, the active faces being arranged on the working surface in the active condition, and are mounted so that they can rotate with respect to the stick about a respective articulation axis in order to pass, upon insertion in a wringing basket, from an active or extended condition in which the respective main longitudinal directions define a working surface, to a wringing or retracted condition in which the respective longitudinal direction of the at least two arms are angularly spaced from the working surface, return means being further provided which are adapted to return the supporting means to the active or extended condition as a consequence of disengagement from the wringing basket, (col. 8, lines 12-27). Rust et al. also teaches that the kinematic connection means comprises at least one articulation element for connection between a cup-shaped element that can be coupled to the end of the stick and the fixed part, (col. 8, lines 15-19, fig. 6).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16,18,20,23 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rust et al. in view of Kresse et al.

Rust et al. teaches all the limitations of the claim except for the wringing basket comprising at least two walls having a plurality of draining openings that converge

toward the bottom of the containment bucket, and forms engagement walls for a respective portion of the cleaning means that is associated with an active face, a collection receptacle arranged below the wringing basket, cleaning means being a cloth made of microfiber. Kresse et al. teaches the wringing basket comprising at least two walls, 33, having a plurality of draining openings that converge toward the bottom of the containment bucket, and forms engagement walls for a respective portion of the cleaning means that is associated with an active face, a collection receptacle, 42, arranged below the wringing basket, (col. 6, lines 50-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the tool of Rust et al. with a wringing basket and containment bucket, as taught by Kresse et al., in order to enhance the mopping capabilities. It would have been further obvious to provide the tool of Rust et al. with the cleaning means being a cloth, as an obvious matter of design choice.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rust et al. in view of Richardson et al.

Rust et al. teaches all the limitations of the claims except for the return means comprising at least one spring which acts between the fixed part and at least one of the two arms or between the two arms in order to keep the supporting means in the active or extended condition. Richardson et al. teaches a spring, 56. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the tool of Rust et al. with spring means, as a form or return means.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rust et al. as modified by Kresse et al. in further view of Jones.

Rust as modified by Kresse teaches all the limitations of the claim except for the retention means comprising a plurality of pins that protrude from the active face and have an enlarged head. Jones teaches a plurality of pins, 143. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the tool of Rust as modified by Kresse, with pins, as taught by Jones, as an alternate retention means.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McLaughlin was cited to show another example of a device for cleaning.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shantese L. McDonald whose telephone number is (571) 272-4486. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S.L.M.  
November 26, 2007

/Joseph J. Hail III/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3723